

MINUTES
SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting – December 16, 2005
DPLU Hearing Room, 9:00 a.m.

The meeting convened at 9:03 a.m., recessed at 10:07 a.m., reconvened at 10:38 a.m., recessed at 11:18 a.m., reconvened at 11:22 a.m., recessed at 11:55 a.m., reconvened at 12:04 p.m. and adjourned at 1:28 p.m.

A. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods

Commissioners Absent: None

Advisors Present: Areigat, Beech, Carlton, Sinsay (DPW); Harron, Taylor (OCC)

Staff Present: Pryor, Beddow, Caldwell, Covic, Esperance, Forsythe, Gowens, Gibson, Giffen, Hulse, Russell, Stocks, Jones, recording secretary

B. Statement of Planning Commission's Proceedings, Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of November 18, 2005.

Action: Beck – Woods

Approve the Minutes of November 18, 2005, with revisions to Page 18, as requested by Commissioner Riess.

Ayes: 7 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes: 0 - None
Abstain: 0 - None
Absent: 0 - None

C. Public Communication: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Commission on any subject matter within the Commission's jurisdiction but not an item on today's Agenda.

None.

D. Formation of Consent Calendar: Items 3 and 7

TM 5158RPL⁵ and AD 99-007, Agenda Item 1:

1. **Palisades Estates, Tentative Map (TM) 5158RPL⁵ and Administrative Permit (AD) 99-007, Bonsall Community Planning Area/North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area** (Continued from December 2, 2005)

Request to subdivide 383 acres into 36 residential lots ranging in size from 2.19 to 9.68 acres and one open space lot. This project proposes lot area averaging pursuant to Section 4230 of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows some of the lots to be a minimum of two acres. The project site is subject to the (18) Multiple Rural Land Use Designation (one dwelling unit per four, eight or 20 acres) and the zoning includes the RR.25 Rural Residential Use Regulations with a minimum lot size of four acres. The project site is located east of the intersection of Elevado Road and Pleasant Heights Road in the area north and east of the City of Vista.

Staff Presentation: Stocks

Proponents: 6; **Opponents:** 0

Commissioner Miller announces that he will abstain from consideration of this Item.

Discussion:

On November 18, 2005, the Planning Commission continued consideration of this Item to allow the applicant to resolve issues pertaining to obtaining an offsite easement for emergency access. At that time, Commissioner Beck expressed concern that Units 4, 5, 19, 18, 22, 21, 25, 28, 27, 32, 33, and 35 are all proposed to be located along the ridgeline, and questioned whether other project alternatives were considered. Commissioner Beck was also disturbed that Lots 1-5, 35 and 36 intrude into the open space corridor and questioned why these Lots weren't eliminated from the project. Staff explained that a number of units were eliminated following extensive negotiations on project design with wildlife agencies. Staff also reminded the Commission at that time that the project as proposed ensures that open space connectivity is maintained. Approximately 65 to 70% of the property will be dedicated as open space.

The applicant has secured the agreement for the offsite easement as discussed at the November 18, 2005 hearing, but an additional easement covering a 300-foot gap in that easement is awaiting recordation.

Administrative Items:

Motion: Riess – Day

Approve Tentative Map 5158RPL⁵ and Administrative Permit AD 99-007, on the condition that the additional easement awaiting recordation is provided within the next 10 days. If not received within that timeframe, the Director of DPLU shall appeal the Planning Commission's decision to the Board of Supervisors.

Discussion of the Motion:

Commissioner Beck states he will not support this Motion. He remains quite unconvinced that the proposed development along the ridgeline is necessary, and believes Lots 35 and 36 negatively impact reserve design. Commissioner Day reminds his colleagues that the County of San Diego has no clear policy on ridgeline development; it merely indicates that development along ridgelines should be avoided where possible. He points out that the Sponsor Groups support the proposal, as does DPLU, State and Federal environmental agencies, non-profit organizations, the fire district and the public.

The applicant reminds the Commission that the proposed project meets the satisfaction of the Bonsall Sponsor Group's ridgeline development policy. Commissioner Beck would like Staff to provide examples of when ridgeline development has been "avoided where possible", as required in the County's policy. He reminds Staff that none of the development proposals are guaranteed a specific number of units. Commissioners Kreitzer and Woods concur with Commissioner Beck, and Commissioner Woods indicates that he would prefer that the environmental constraints associated with this project be reviewed again to determine if the Lots can be relocated off the ridgeline while still maintaining the proposed density. Commissioner Kreitzer agrees. Staff reiterates that the development envelope and environmental constraints have ensured that the number of Lots were minimized to as few as possible. Chairman Brooks remains somewhat torn about whether to vote for approval of this project and discusses the need for a more definitive ridgeline development policy.

Ayes:	3 -	Brooks, Day, Riess
Noes:	3 -	Beck, Kreitzer, Woods
Abstain:	1 -	Miller
Absent:	0 -	None

Due to the lack of a majority vote, the Motion fails and the project is deemed denied.

TM 5320, Agenda Item 2:

2. Waldman Tentative Map, (TM) 5320, North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area (continued from December 2, 2005)

Request for a Tentative Map to subdivide a 7.22-acre parcel into six single-family lots ranging in size from 1.02 to 1.45 acres. The subject property is in the (1.1) Current Urban Development (CUDA) Regional Category and the (2) Residential (one dwelling unit per acre) Land Use Designation of the General Plan. The site is zoned (RR1) Rural Residential Use Regulations (one dwelling per acre) and is located east of Foothill Drive and north of Huntalas Lane in the unincorporated portion of the County of San Diego.

Staff Presentation: Caldwell (DPLU); Carlton, Shick (DPW)

Proponents: 4; **Opponents:** 0

Recommendations are made by a neighboring property that the applicant (1) not be allowed to install street lights or solid fences; (2) ensure that there is adequate drainage; and (3) ensure that the subdivision does not become a gated community. This property owner also requests that the applicant provide speed bumps and pedestrian/equestrian trails through the proposed development.

The applicant's representative expresses willingness to comply with most of the suggestions in the property owner's letter if possible, but points out that most of them fall under the CC&R's, which the County of San Diego does not enforce. Counsel reminds the Commission that Staff has had no time to review these requests. No trail program currently exists for this area of the County, and Staff recommends that the speaker contact the Department of Parks and Recreation's trails coordinator to discuss his suggestion.

With respect to requiring speed bumps, Commissioner Beck does not believe the speaker's request is unreasonable. Staff explains that the issue of requiring speed bumps on this private road was not raised until this morning and there has been no time to review its feasibility; however, the recommendation is not supported by DPW representatives, who do not consider speed bumps adequate traffic-calming devices. In addition, local fire district representatives must be contacted to ensure that they have no concerns with the installation of speed bumps. Commissioner Miller informs his colleagues that fire district representatives believe speed bumps are more of a hindrance than a benefit during emergency situations, because they negatively impact response time and can damage emergency vehicles attempting to cross them at high speed.

TM 5320, Agenda Item 2:

Action: Woods – Miller

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5320, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

TM 5339RPL² and P03-112, Agenda Item 3:

3. Fallbrook Development, Inc., Tentative Map (TM) 5339RPL² and Major Use Permit P03-112, Fallbrook Community Planning Area (continued from December 2, 2005)

Proposed project consisting of a major subdivision of 21.45 acres located at 420 Dougherty Street into 28 single-family residential lots with minimum lot sizes of 0.25 acres, three open space lots (for preservation of coast live oaks and a portion of the existing citrus grove), and a private street lot. A concurrent Major Use Permit establishes a Planned Residential Development (PDP) to allow recreational amenities including tennis and basketball courts in exchange for clustered residential density and smaller lot sizes. The subject property is zoned (RR) Rural Residential Use Regulations with minimum lot sizes of 0.5 acres and is designated (3) Residential by the Fallbrook Community Plan.

Staff Presentation: Gowens

Proponents: 1; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Woods – Riess

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5339RPL², which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law; and

Grant Major Use Permit P03-112, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and State law.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

TM 5246RPL², Agenda Item 4:

4. **Larissa Cham Major Subdivision, Tentative Map (TM) 5246RPL², Lakeside Community Planning Area** (continued from the meeting of November 18, 2005)

Proposed major subdivision of 4.65 net acres into 15 lots ranging in size from 10,045 square feet (net) to 11,539 square feet (net). The site is within the Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) Regional Category and is subject to the (5) Residential (4.3 dwelling units per acre) General Plan Land Use Designation. The project is under the RV4 (Variable Family Residential) and RS4 (Single-Family Residential) Use Regulations, with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. The site is located at 8658 Winter Gardens Boulevard north of Sapote Drive.

Staff Presentation: Beddow

Proponents: 2; **Opponents:** 1

Discussion:

Staff has reviewed the concerns raised at the November 18, 2005 Planning Commission meeting regarding existing offsite draining problems and visited the project site. Staff believes this project, as proposed by the applicant, will actually improve existing drainage problems in the area by reducing the flow of run-off, and the applicant is willing to contribute to maintenance of the existing drainage channel on a neighboring landowner's property.

Action: Miller – Riess

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5246RPL², which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

TM 5358RPL³ and R04-006, Agenda Item 5:

5. Marker Condominium Subdivision and Zone Reclassification, Tentative Map (TM) 5358RPL³ and R04-006, North County Metropolitan Sub-regional Plan Area

Proposed Zone Reclassification and Major Subdivision. The Zone Reclassification proposes changing the building type from "C", which allows single-family residences on a single lot to "M", which allows a variety of housing types, including detached homes on a single condominium lot in order to accommodate nine detached homes on a single condominium lot. A five-foot high noise barrier is also included in the project's design. The Major Subdivision is required for the division of 2.14 acres into nine detached homes. The site is subject to the (6) Residential Land Use Designation and the RS4 Single-Family Residential Use Regulations with minimum lot sizes of 10,000 square feet. The project site is located on the north side of Woodland Avenue, approximately 350 feet west of the intersection of South Santa Fe Avenue and Woodland Drive.

Staff Presentation: Forsythe

Proponents: 2; **Opponents:** 0

Discussion:

This Item is approved on consent following Staff's clarification as to why the requirement for undergrounding utilities is being waived in this instance (none of the surrounding utilities have been undergrounded). The County of San Diego and utility companies prefer to underground entire neighborhoods or large developments all at once rather than one property at a time.

Action: Beck – Kreitzer

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Adopt the Ordinance approving a change in the Building Type Designator from "C" to "M" (Zone Reclassification R04-006), with no change in the RS4 Use Regulation, 4.35 dwelling units per area; and
2. Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5358RPL³, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law.

TM 5358RPL³ and R04-006, Agenda Item 5:

Discussion of the Action:

Commissioner Riess questions whether this project will result in an increase in the volume of drainage, because the drainage study indicates that areas immediately downstream can't adequately manage a 100-year storm. Staff explains that the hydrology has been reviewed extensively and, through working with the developer on an alternative design that takes the existing conditions into consideration, no resulting unreasonable increase in the lines of inundation is expected.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

P05-029, Agenda Item 6:

6. Associated Residential Services Group Care Home, Major Use Permit P05-029, Spring Valley Community Plan Area

Request for a Major Use Permit for Group Care to increase the occupancy of an existing Group Care home for six dependent and neglected children, which is allowed by right, to a total of 12 children in an existing single-family residence. No additional construction or structural changes are proposed. The project is sited on property zoned RS4 Single-Family Residential Use Regulations, which permits Group Care in excess of six persons under the Civic Use Types with the approval of a Major Use Permit pursuant to Section 2105.b of the Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is designated (5) Residential, which allows urban residential uses in the Spring Valley Community Plan. This project site is located at 8835 Kenwood Drive in Spring Valley.

Staff Presentation: Gowens

Proponents: 3; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Beck – Miller

Grant Major Use Permit P05-029, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and State law.

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

R00-002, Agenda Item 7:

7. Ferry Ranch Zone Reclassification, R00-002, Lakeside Community Planning Area

Proposed Zone Reclassification to change the Special Area Regulations by adding the "H" (Historical/Archaeological Landmark or District) Special Area Designator over the historic Ferry Ranch Grant House. The application of the "H" Designator is pursuant to Condition C11(b) of Tentative Map 5147RPL, which was approved by the Planning Commission on December 3, 1999. The Conservation Element of the Lakeside Community Plan identifies the Ferry Ranch Grant House as an important historic site associated with the "Big Ranch Era". Policy 7 of the Conservation Element – Environmental Goal recommends that the "H" Designator be applied to structures that are historically significant. The Ferry Ranch Grant House is identified as a historically significant structure, and is located at 10414 Chase Creek Lane, southwest of Oak Creek Drive. The site is subject to the (5) Residential Land Use Designation and the RS3, Single-Family Residential Use Regulations.

Staff Presentation: Beddow

Proponents: 0; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Woods – Riess

Recommend that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Find, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, that the County of San Diego as a lead agency under CEQA, has considered the environmental effects of the project as shown in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by the lead agency dated October 28, 1999 on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) as Environmental Review Number 98-14-031 and the "Environmental Review Update Checklist for Projects with a Previously Approved Environmental Document" dated December 1, 2005 on file with DPLU as Environmental Review Number 98-14-031A, and concurs with its Findings; and
2. Adopt the Form of Ordinance changing the zoning classification of certain property, R00-002.

R00-002, Agenda Item 7:

Ayes:	7 -	Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

AA 05-003, Agenda Item 8:

8. Tollis, Incorporated and 1560 N. Magnolia Avenue, LLC, Administrative Appeal (AA) 05-003, Unincorporated Portion of the City of El Cajon

Appeal of the Director's Decision issued on October 20, 2005 denying a full six-month extension of the three-year non-conforming use period (which expired on July 12, 2005) for Tollis, Inc., and 1560 N. Magnolia, LLC, the adult entertainment business operating at 1560 N. Magnolia Avenue.

Section 6930(e) of the County's Zoning Ordinance allows for a maximum six-month extension of the three-year non-conforming use period for adult entertainment establishments. Under Section 6930(e), the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use must consider the following factors in deciding whether to grant an application for an extension: "1) the availability of alternative locations; 2) the term of the lease; 3) the cost of any improvements that would only be of use to an Adult Business; and 4) the potential for other conforming uses to locate on the site." Based on this review, the Director determined that a 30-day time extension was warranted rather than the six-month extension requested by the Appellant.

Staff Presentation: Hulse

Proponents: 0; **Opponents:** 1

Staff has determined that a full six-month extension could not be granted to the appellant because has not proven his establishment meets the four factors identified in the Zoning Ordinance in that (1) there are many sites (76) within the County where the establishment can be relocated; (2) there have been no improvements to the property that would only be of use to an adult business; (3) other commercial businesses would not be limited to leasing or buying the building in which the establishment is currently located, and (4) there is no proof that a non-adult commercial establishment operator would be unwilling to assume the lease or sign a new lease for the building. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny this appeal and direct the appellant to immediately cease operation of his establishment.

Many of the Planning Commissioners support allowing the applicant the full six-month extension, particularly since this type of business is the only type of business to which Section 6930(e) of the Zoning Ordinance applies. They note that the six-month extension will expire in January 2006.

R00-002, Agenda Item 7:

Action: Riess – Kreitzer

Grant the appeal (AA 05-003) and allow the appellant the full six-month extension, which will end on January 14, 2006.

Ayes:	6 -	Beck, Brooks, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	1 -	Day
Abstain:	0 -	None
Absent:	0 -	None

POD 05-072, Agenda Item 9:

9. POD 05-072, Business Process Re-engineering Revisions to the San Diego County California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Revisions to Policy I-119

Proposed changes initiated as a part of the County's Business Process Re-engineering efforts to substantially reduce the processing time for discretionary permit applications. The proposed changes modify the procedures for preparing CEQA documents; expand the pre-application process for privately-initiated projects; require the development and maintenance of the CEQA standards, including Guidelines for Determining Significance and report format requirements; modify County Counsel's role in reviewing Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs); and change the process for placement on and administration of the County's CEQA Consultant List. Implementation of the project will require revisions to the San Diego County CEQA Guidelines and Board of Supervisors Policy I-119. Policy I-119 has a sunset date, which calls for a routine and systematic evaluation and reconsideration of the Policy on December 31, 2009.

Staff Presentation: Gibson, Giffen

Proponents: 3; **Opponents:** 7

Staff's goals with the proposed recommendations are to maintain or improve the quality of projects and alleviate sources of frustration and dissatisfaction with DPLU's processes, particularly with the length of time it takes to process projects. According to Staff, the existing process requires multiple reviews, loop-backs and hand-offs to multiple parties. The current process is complex and unclear to applicants and the public, is often adversarial, frustrating for all involved, and subject to gamesmanship, abuse and manipulation; all in an effort to ensure that the individual writing the document performed adequately.

Staff's recommendations include front-loading the process and setting reasonable expectations of applicants, improving the initial quality of documents, and revising review procedures. Staff proposes expanding the pre-application process to identify constraints, major issues, community complaints, biological issues, and all other pertinent issues and design around them. By identifying and resolving major issues early, Staff hopes to eliminate the need for repeated reviews/revisions. Clearly written standards, thresholds, boilerplates, checklists and report formats will be implemented. All of these efforts will result in more complete applications and more timely decisions.

POD 05-072, Agenda Item 9:

Staff informs the Commission that DPLU's current Consultants List contains more than 600 individuals, and it is difficult to remove individuals from that List. Staff proposes implementing a process for consultants that is similar RFOs to develop a shorter and more adequate list of the best, most-qualified consultants to work on the Department's CEQA documents.

Staff proposes requiring a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to ensure that the roles and responsibilities of each entity – Staff, applicants and consultants - are clearly understood. Staff also proposes limiting contract provisions, and specifying how communications are to occur by ensuring that County Staff is kept advised of key decisions regarding environmental review. The current review process can involve numerous back-and-forth exchanges between Staff and the consultants until an adequate document is received. Staff believes requiring standard report formats with one formal review by County Staff, and finalization of the reports in collaborative work-group meetings will greatly reduce these back-and-forth exchanges. Electronic submittals are to be part of this new process, and those consultants found to be in violation of the MOU can be removed from the County's Consultants List.

Modification of Policy I-119 will result in obtaining County Counsel's review of the document following public review- unless there is a compelling reason to seek Counsel's input earlier in the process - instead of having Counsel review the document prior to and following public review. It is Staff's goal to utilize Counsel's services in the best and most productive way possible.

Under the new process, it is believed that processing times will be substantially improved, and costs associated with obtaining and reviewing environmental documents will be reduced. The time needed to process Negative Declarations and EIRs will be greatly reduced, and labor costs will be reduced by eliminating the need for so many iterations of the documents. An additional benefit to the private sector will be a great reduction in applicant holding costs. Staff's draft County CEQA Guidelines have been revised to strictly conform to what State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require.

The Planning Commissioners and members of the public commend Staff for their efforts as a much-needed undertaking. However, several speakers voice concerns about the provisions contained in the proposed MOU, namely Items 1.g., 2.d, 2.e and 2.f. They believe these provisions could actually result in delays and stifle communication between all parties.

Commissioner Riess seeks reassurance that Planning and Sponsor Group representatives are apprised of the environmental issues associated with projects. He believes this will potentially reduce issues.

POD 05-072, Agenda Item 9:

Staff is reminded that shortening the qualified Consultants List will not improve quality. If individuals are qualified, they should be allowed on the list. Recommendations from the audience include recording meetings between Staff, applicants and consultants to ensure accuracy; defining the public's role in this process; requiring orientation and continuing education of consultants and Staff; implementing a coherent code of ethics; and eliminating plans to reduce the Consultants List;

In response to questions from Commissioner Beck regarding incorporation of information contained in DPLU's "Greenbook" into the revised CEQA Guidelines, Staff assures him that this will occur, with the first six subsets being made available for review in August 2006.

Action: Riess – Miller

Endorse Staff's recommendations to:

1. Find that the proposed project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as specified under Section 15061(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines;
2. Affirm the Department's determination that the proposed project will substantially reduce the processing time for discretionary permit applications;
3. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors;
 - a. Direct the Chief Administrative Officer to pursue the Business Process Reengineering recommendations for this project;
 - b. Revise the San Diego County CEQA Guidelines as shown in the attached draft Guidelines;
 - c. Revise Board of Supervisors Policy I-119, as shown in the draft policy; and
 - d. Review the implementation of the proposed project in 18 months.

Discussion of the Action:

The Planning Commissioners support a majority of the recommendations made today, particularly the concept of mandatory continuing education, and not limiting the List to certified engineers only. Commissioner Beck announces that he will abstain from voting on Staff's recommendations at this time, but hopes they

POD 05-072, Agenda Item 9:

will result in a more transparent process, and that Community Plan standards can be elevated to equal stature with other pre-application issues that are identified. Commissioner Beck recommends that Planning/Sponsor Group representatives be provided with the opportunity to provide input to Staff on these recommendations, and agrees with Commissioner Riess' recommendation that Planning/Sponsor Group representatives be apprised of the environmental issues associated with projects. Staff assures Commissioner Beck that Planning/Sponsor Group representatives will receive the same public-review documents they've always received, only quicker. Commissioner Day recommends that all of the consultants currently on the County's list be notified about Staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Beck insists that Staff must initially identify and reconcile issues such as zoning, land constraints, the Community Plan, and impacts on biology before developing footprints for prospective projects. Staff assures him that this is the fundamental purpose of process reengineering, in addition to assisting the applicant in setting reasonable expectations. Staff acknowledges that applicants will probably come in with preliminary ideas of what they want to accomplish, but Staff's intent is to make clear for the applicant what is reasonably feasible for the property without the applicant's proposal being the starting point for negotiation.

Commissioner Beck discusses proposed Greenbook revisions. He believes the information and guidelines contained in that document are fundamental to the success of process reengineering, and seeks reassurance that a draft of those proposed revisions will be available in August 2006. Staff indicates that a subset of six most commonly used guidelines will be available at that time for review.

It is Commissioner Beck's understanding that these guidelines will then be imbedded within the proposed CEQA process streamlining as part of the package applicants will utilize to reconcile their project proposals with issues such as the Community Plan, land constraints, biological resources, and zoning, and as information the Planning Groups and others will be able to depend upon. Staff responds affirmatively. Commissioner Beck also seeks and receives reassurance from Staff that applicants will be apprised during initial contact of requirements such as the Resource Protection Ordinance and the MSCP.

Ayes:	6 -	Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess, Woods
Noes:	0 -	None
Abstain:	1 -	Beck
Absent:	0 -	None

Administrative:

E. Director's Report

No Director's report was provided at today's meeting.

F. Report on actions of Planning Commission's Subcommittees:

There were no Subcommittee reports provided at today's meeting.

G. Designation of member to represent the Planning Commission at Board of Supervisors meeting(s):

The Board of Supervisors does not meet until January 2006.

H. Discussion of correspondence received by the Planning Commission:

There was none.

Department Report

I. Scheduled Meetings:

January 13, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
January 27, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
February 10, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
February 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 10, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 7, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 21, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 5, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

There being no further business to be considered at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on January 13, 2006 in the DPLU Hearing Room, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California.